

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Viriginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

CONFIRMATION NO. 1867

10/821,742

04/09/2004

Michael T. Fusco

EXAMINER

7590

FRANCIS, FAYE

Richard D. Zimmerman

Chace Ruttenberg & Freedman LLP

Suite 300 One Park Row

Providence, RI 02903

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3728

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/821,742	FUSCO, MICHAEL T.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Faye Francis	3728
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status	,	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 		
Application Papers		
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 April 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means", "said," and "comprises" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 3728

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of legal phraseology "comprises" in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 2 line 8 and page 4 line 2, it appears that "switched circuit" should be replaced with -- switching circuit--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, it appears that "switched circuit" should be replaced with --switching circuit--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sims.

Sims discloses in the embodiment of Figs 2-3, a fog/smoke filled bubble blower [machine device 10] comprising: a housing [fuselage 15] attached to a battery box [enclosure 16], exhaust fan [automatic air blower, col 5 line 44], fog fluid reservoir [smoke generating chamber 24], fog chamber [flexible portion 83], heating element assembly [filament 42], nozzle [conduit 20], and bubble wand [aperture 22], so that when fog fluid from the fog fluid reservoir reaches the heating element assembly, the

Art Unit: 3728

fog fluid is vaporized in the fog chamber, and when the bubble wand is dipped into bubble solution, and the exhaust fan is activated, fog is sucked out of the fog chamber and forced through the nozzle and through the bubble wand, forming a bubble which is filled with fog [col 3 lines 4-23].

Sims may not specifically disclose an electric motor having switching circuits. However, Sims discloses that it would have been obvious to use an automatic air blower to replace manual air bellows [col 5 lines 42-43]. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such an automatic air blower system would inherently encompass an electric motor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device of Sims with an electric motor having switching circuits in order to have a simple and effective device for generating fog/smoked filed bubble.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Francis whose telephone number is 571-272-4423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/821,742

Art Unit: 3728

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FF

Faye Francis